

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, and 11 are independent claims. Claims 2-7, 9, and 10 are dependent claims.

The Examiner objected to claims 4 and 5 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1-3 and 6-11 have been rejected. Amendments to claims 1, 2, 8, and 11 are presented herein.

FIG. 1 has been amended and a replacement sheet is attached.

No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Changes to the Drawings

On page 2 of the Office Action, the proposed drawing correction filed on March 13, 2003 was approved. Thus, a replacement figure incorporating the approved correction is submitted herewith.

The attached drawing includes changes to FIG. 1. In FIG. 1, the legend --PRIOR ART-- has been included.

No new matter has been added. Approval and entry of the attached replacement sheet are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In numbered paragraph 2 on pages 2-7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 6-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uchida et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,890,824) in view of Martin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,508,500) and Owens et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,371,368). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the reasons presented below.

Claim 1 recites, as amended, "... a cash conveyor conveying cash to and from the first cash storage unit and the second cash storage unit, the first cash storage unit and the second cash storage unit being separated from the cash conveyor; and a bill cassette and a coin cassette, belonging to the first cash storage unit, that are respectively locked inside the machine and remain locked when the cash logistics company retrieves same from the machine ...". Independent claims 8 and 11 recite similar language.

An aspect of the present invention is to provide safe cash retrieval of a store sales proceed depositing machine by a cash logistics company. The cash stored in a cash storage unit of a depositing machine is counted and data regarding the amount of deposited cash are transmitted to the cash logistics company. The cash stored in the cash storage unit is retrieved by an employee of the cash logistics company, and then the cash logistics company compares the cash in the cash storage unit with the cash data.

The store sales proceeds depositing machine according to the present invention is able to prevent the loss of cash during transportation of the cash to the cash logistics company, and to maintain security of the stored cash in the cash storage unit, even if the cash conveyance mechanism of the depositing machine malfunctions.

In the present invention, as specified in claim 1, the bill cassette and the coin cassette of the first cash storage unit remain locked when the cash logistics company retrieves and transports the first cash storage unit to the cash logistics company. Thus, the employee of the cash logistics company never has access to the cash, providing greater security of the cash.

In contrast, it is the position of the applicants that the cited references disclose that an employee of a cash logistics company retrieves the cash itself. Thus, in the cited references, cash may be lost during transportation and the cash in the cash storage unit may not match the cash data.

Also, it is the position of the applicants that none of the cited references considers the malfunction of a depositing machine due to jamming of the deposited cash in the cash conveyance mechanism. In the present invention, the cash in the first cash storage unit and the second cash storage unit is safe because the cash storage units remain locked. In contrast, in the cited references, the cash stored in the depositing machine may be lost because the stored cash can be directly accessed.

Thus, it is submitted that independent claims 1, 8, and 11 patentably distinguish over the prior art. The dependent claims depend respectively from the above-discussed independent claims 1 and 8 and are patentable over the prior art for at least the reasons discussed above.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 1-11 patentably distinguish over the prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under § 103.

Conclusion

It is submitted that none of the references, either taken alone or in combination, teaches the present claimed invention. Thus, claims 1-11 are deemed to be in a condition suitable for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Finally, if there are any additional fees associated with filing of this response, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 12/18/03

By: C. Joan Gilsdorf
Christine Joan Gilsdorf
Registration No. 43,635

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501